UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED

2008 SEP -5 PM 2: 48

T(FF	D: <u>U. S. I</u> ROM: <u>R. Mu</u>	DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Mosk@Withern district court Mosk@Withern district of California
CASE NO: 08000740 PTM (AID) DOGUN (TIME)		
CASE TITLE: Stephen v. Bravo		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Imminent Danger Exception		
	Opon ti	he submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:
1	Local Rule	Discrepancy
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
	7.1	Missing table of contents
$\bar{\Box}$	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
$\bar{\Box}$	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
ō		Supplemental documents require court order
$\overline{\Box}$		
X		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
4		OTHER: Not in pleading format and no proof of service.
	/	ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE ORDERD: ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE
T IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
<u>X</u> .	The docume	nt is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
_	The docume	nt is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a order on all parties.
	Rejected doc	nument to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers
	Counsel is act to Local Rule	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Dated:/ cc: All Partie	CHAMBERS OF: Judge Maskauitz By: SM PSLC